kelep is described by Dr. Cook as capturing and consuming 'adult insects of many and diverse kinds,' so that we may be sure that it will not confine itself to boll-weevils, even if it succeeds in surviving the winters and floods of Texas. If we except a few vegetarian species like the curiously modified fungus-growing Attii, ants, like human beings, thrive best on a varied diet. Cook says that 'The discovery of the ant [the kelep] supplies a practical reason for the existence of the nectaries [of the cotton plant] hitherto quite unsuspected, and it suggests the further possibility that the weevil and the ant have been factors in the evolution of the cotton plant, for the weevil is not known to feed on any plant except cotton.' This statement is clearly at variance with the current views of many botanists and myrmecologists, who have compared the much exaggerated and largely fictitious accounts of the dependence of plants on protecting ants with the actual conditions.* Furthermore, even if we accept the views of Schimper and some other botanists in regard to the protection afforded plants by these insects, we should still be unable to understand why the boll-weevil was not long ago exterminated by the kelep, inasmuch as the beetle is clearly injurious to the cotton plant and hence to the supposed best interest of the ant.

The above considerations indicate that there is little probability that the kelep can be successfully established in Texas or adjoining states, or, if established, that it will be an appreciable factor in the extermination of the boll-weevil. This becomes even clearer if we glance for a moment at the more general subject of the introduction of ants into foreign countries. At first blush ants would seem to

* See, *e. g.*, the excellent article by Ernest Rettig, 'Ameisenpflanzen—Pflanzenameisen: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der von Ameisen bewohnten Pflanzen und der Beziehungen zwischen beiden,' Jena, Gustav Fischer, 1904.